	Case 2:09-cv-00037-MJP Document 431	Filed 05/30/12 Page 1 of 7
1 2		THE HONORABLE MARSHA J. PECHMAN
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
9	AT SI	EATTLE
10	IN RE: WASHINGTON MUTUAL	Master Case No.: C09-0037 (MJP)
11	MORTGAGE BACKED SECURITIES LITIGATION	PLAINTIFFS' RULE 7(g) SURREPLY TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
12	This Document Relates to: ALL CASES	SUMMARY JUDGMENT
13		
14		ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	Plaintiffs' Rule 7(g) Surreply to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment Case No. C09-037 MJP	

Case 2:09-cv-00037-MJP Document 431 Filed 05/30/12 Page 2 of 7

Defendants include in their Reply in Further Support of Their Motion for Summary
Judgment ("Def. Reply") [ECF No. 426] a series of arguments which are, in effect, motions in
limine which should either be stricken in accordance with Local Rule 7(g), or to which Plaintiffs
are entitled to respond. See, e.g., Hoffman v. Construction Protective Servs., 541 F.3d 1175,
1179 (9th Cir. 2008) (Rule 37 motion to exclude witnesses is a motion in limine to which
plaintiffs are entitled to respond); Schneider v. Twin City Fire Ins. Co., No. C11-04-MJP, 2011
WL 5592588, at *4 (N.D. Wash. Nov. 16, 2011) (motion to strike granted for exhibits submitted
with reply brief where party had no opportunity to respond). Specifically, by this Surreply,
Plaintiffs seek to strike ¶¶2-4 of the Declaration of Defendants' litigation counsel, Hector Valdes
(the "Valdes Decl.") [ECF No. 427], to respond to Defendants' request to exclude the Senate's
investigative findings (the "PSI Report") as inadmissible hearsay and to strike the declarations of
Diana Jeanty ("Jeanty Decl.") and Denise Luedtke ("Luedtke Decl."), a WaMu senior
underwriter, and underwriting manager, respectively, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37.

As to the Valdes Decl., Valdes, an attorney with Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP, has not shown that he has the personal knowledge or is competent to testify under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(4) about the contents or integrity of 8.4 million pages of electronic files produced in this litigation. *See Paulsen v. PS Business Parks, L.P.*, No. C10-1031 MJP, 2011 WL 3419894, at *5 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 4, 2011) (under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56, supporting affidavit must be on personal knowledge); *Kennedy v. AJVS, Inc.*, No. C11-1231 MJP, 2012 WL 1748013 (W.D. Wash. May 15, 2012) (excluding unnecessary and inaccurate comments regarding exhibits). Valdes testifies that he "supervised a team of attorneys and legal assistants" who ran electronic searches to identify references to the Downey and Montebello Loan Fulfillment Centers ("LFCs") in 8,440,993 pages of electronic loan files (Valdes Decl., ¶2). This search is only meaningful if the electronic files he searched contained relevant information about the LFCs that originated the loans and if the electronic data is understandable and reliable. David Beck testified that, in fact,

Case 2:09-cv-00037-MJP Document 431 Filed 05/30/12 Page 3 of 7

WaMu did not track its loans by individual loan center. Beck Dep. (Pltfs.' Ex. 4¹) at 83:5-84:4. The internal loan tapes Defendants submitted with their Motion for Summary Judgment (Def. Exs. 15-20) do not appear to contain this information, the columns of data contained in Exhibits 15-20 are hardly self-evident and Defendants have refused to produce or identify a key to decipher this electronic information. *See* the Declaration of Anne Box ("Box Decl."), ¶¶8-9. Finally, even those loans Valdes identifies as having been originated by the two California LFCs are suspect because they include references to mortgage loans on properties in Virginia, Massachusetts and New York. *See* Box Decl., ¶10.

As to the PSI Report, government investigative reports are assumed to be admissible under Fed. R. Evid. 803(8)(c) in the first instance and the burden is on Defendants to establish that they are not trustworthy. See Beech Aircraft Corp. v. Rainey, 488 U.S. 153, 167 (1988); also Sullivan v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc., 623 F.3d 770, 778 (9th Cir. 2010) (party opposing introduction of public report as untrustworthy has burden of coming forward with negative factors). Congressional reports have been admitted as reliable where they are supported by voluminous documentary productions, key witness interviews, and public hearings. Barry v. Trustees of Int'l Ass'n Full-Time Salaried Officers and Emps. of Outside Local Unions and District Counsel's (Iron Workers) Pension Plan, 467 F. Supp. 2d 91, 94-95 (D.D.C. 2006). Here, the Senate task force reviewed tens of millions of pages of documents, consulted with industry experts, and conducted over 150 interviews and depositions, including interviews of key deponents Cheryl Feltgen (Feltgen Dep. Pltfs.' Ex. 17 at 16:29-17:3) and David Schneider (Schneider Dep. Pltfs.' Ex. 61 at 43:17-44:5). Furthermore, the PSI held multiple days of public hearings and called Defendant David Beck, key deponents David Schneider, Randy Melby and several other top WaMu executives as witnesses. The PSI Report was further corroborated by the report of the U.S. Inspector General. (Pltfs.' Ex. 59 at 10-12.) Tellingly, Defendants do not challenge the admissibility of the Inspector General's report.

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

[&]quot;Pltfs.' Ex." refers to documents attached as exhibits to the Declaration of John T. Jasnoch, dated May 11, 2012 [ECF No. 415].

Plaintiffs' Rule 7(g) Surreply to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment Case No. C09-037 MJP

Case 2:09-cv-00037-MJP Document 431 Filed 05/30/12 Page 4 of 7

Moreover, Defendants David Beck and witnesses David Schneider and Randy Melby were each confronted with the Report's findings in their depositions and given an opportunity to testify in response. Beck Dep. Pltfs.' Ex. 5 at 61-68; Schneider Dep. Pltfs.' Ex. 61 at 57-66; Melby Dep. Pltfs.' Ex. 62 at 152-55. Defendants offer only their *ipsa dixit* that the Report is "inherently politicized" and the findings irrelevant, relying upon district court cases in other jurisdictions that were decided before *Beech Aircraft* and *Sullivan*. This is inadequate to satisfy their burden to preclude this evidence. *Id.*, 623 F.3d at 778.

Finally, Defendants' efforts to strike the Jeanty Decl. and Luedtke Decl. should be denied because the failure to earlier disclose their identities was either substantially justified or harmless under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37 and 26(a)(1). See Hoffman, 541 F.3d at 1179. Despite Plaintiffs' request in Interrogatory No. 6 to "Identify all Persons with whom You discussed your underwriting policies, procedures, or standards relating to the Certificates," Defendants identified no one. See Box Decl., Ex. A. Plaintiffs have been diligently wading through 27 million pages of documents largely produced in August and September 2011, and only with the assistance of their private investigator, recently identified the underwriter witnesses. See Box Decl., ¶¶4-5. Contrary to Defendants' arguments, the testimony of this type of witness, the PSI Report, and the other evidence Plaintiffs offered in opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion is precisely the type of showing which Courts have held is adequate to sustain an MBS plaintiff's Section 11 case. See, e.g., Fed. Housing Fin. Agency v. USB Americas, Inc., No. 11 Civ. 5201, 2012 WL 1570856, at *20 (S.D.N.Y. May 4, 2012); In re Bear Stearns Mort. Pass-Through Cert. Litig., No. 08 Civ. 8053, 2012 WL 1076216, at *16 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 30, 2012). For all these reasons, the Valdes Decl. should be stricken and Defendants' requests to preclude Plaintiffs' evidence denied.

24 Dated: May 30, 2012

Respectfully submitted, SCOTT+SCOTT LLP

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

/s/ Beth Kaswan

26

Beth Kaswan (admitted *pro hac vice*)

27

28

Plaintiffs' Rule 7(g) Surreply to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment Case No. C09-037 MJP 3

1		500 Fifth Avenue, 40th Floor New York, New York 10110
2		Telephone: (212) 223-6444
_		Facsimile: (212) 223-6334
3		Email: bkaswan@scott-scott.com
4		Anne L. Box (admitted pro hac vice)
5		John T. Jasnoch (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
		SCOTT+SCOTT LLP
6		707 Broadway, Suite 1000 San Diego, California 92101
7		Telephone: 619-233-4565
		Fax: 619-233-0508
8		E-mail: abox@scott-scott.com
9		jjasnoch@scott-scott.com
10		
11		COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PLLC
11		Steven J. Toll
12		Joshua S. Devore (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
13		S. Douglas Bunch (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
13		1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
14		Suite 500, West Tower
15		Washington, DC 20005 Telephone: (202) 408-4600
13		Facsimile: (202) 408-4699
16		Email: stoll@cohenmilstein.com
17		jdevore@cohenmilstein.com
		dbunch@cohenmilstein.com
18		Christopher Lometti (admitted pro hac vice)
19		Daniel B. Rehns (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
20		150 East 52nd Street, Thirtieth Floor
20		New York, New York 10022
21		Telephone: (212) 838-7797
22		Facsimile: (212) 838-7745 Email: clometti@cohenmilstain.com
		drehns@cohenmilstein.com
23		Lead Counsel for the Class
24		Lead Counselfor the Class
25		
26		
27		
28	Plaintiffs' Rule 7(g) Surreply to	4

| Plaintiffs' Rule 7(g) Surreply to | Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment | Case No. C09-037 MJP

Case 2:09-cv-00037-MJP Document 431 Filed 05/30/12 Page 6 of 7

1		TOUSLEY BRAIN STEPHENS PLLC
		Kim D. Stephens, WSBA #11984 Janissa A. Strabuk, WSBA #21827
2		1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2200
3		Seattle, Washington 98101
4		Telephone: (206) 682-5600
4		Facsimile: (206) 682-2992
5		Email: kstephens@tousley.com jstrabuk@tousley.com
6		jstrabuk @ tousicy.com
		Liaison Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Class
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	Plaintiffs' Rule 7(g) Surreply to	5

Plaintiffs' Rule 7(g) Surreply to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment Case No. C09-037 MJP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 30, 2012, I caused the foregoing to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the email addresses denoted on the Electronic Mail Notice List, and I hereby certify that I caused the foregoing document or paper to be mailed via the United States Postal Service to the non-CM/ECF participants indicated on the Manual Notice List.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 30, 2012.

/s/ Anne L. Box

Anne L. Box SCOTT+SCOTT LLP 707 Broadway, Suite 1000 San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: 619-233-4565 Fax: 619-233-0508

E-mail: abox@scott-scott.com